# BAIL APPLICATION

1 (In open court.) 2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All Rise. Criminal cause for 3 bail application. United States of America vs. Karl Jordan, 4 docket 20-CR-305. 5 Would you all please state your appearances for the 6 record, starting with the Government. 7 MR. McCONNELL: Good morning. Artie McConnell for 8 the United States. I'm joined by Robert Long from Pretrial 9 Services. 10 THE COURT: Hello. 11 MR. LONG: Good morning, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Good to see you. 13 MR. LONG: Same. 14 MR. HUESTON: Good morning, your Honor. Michael 15 Hueston and John Diaz and Monica Nejathaim for Karl Jordan who 16 is standing next to me. 17 THE COURT: Good morning. All right, folks, we're here today for a bail 18 19 hearing determination in this matter. 20 This is your application, counsel, I'm going to ask 21 that you proceed. 22 MR. HUESTON: Thank you, your Honor, I appreciate 23 the opportunity. 24 THE COURT: If you could stand. 25 MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor.

# BAIL APPLICATION

I appreciate the opportunity to address the Court about this issue. Let me first say that I really want to focus on the strength of the package. What we propose is a million --

THE COURT: I don't think you should start with the package, that puts the cart before the horse, if I don't know a package is something I'm going to do. I think you should probably start with the basis for a bail in the first place.

MR. HUESTON: I appreciate that.

Looking at the case, clearly this is a presumption case. The issues that the Court has to consider are dangerousness and flight of risk.

We look at it in terms of the analysis in terms of -- I'll talk about dangerousness first. Clearly we have serious charges. I'm going to address the strength of the Government's case but I do want to talk about some other issues at well.

Let me talk about the strength of the Government's case. I think that's a critical factor for the Court to consider. What we pointed out in our investigation and dealing with the Government in the past 18, 19 months, we pressed for information showing that Mr. Jordan was involved in the Mizell homicide. What we've seen is the absolute absence on that point. I'm not making an overstatement. This is not hyperbole.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### 4

# BAIL APPLICATION

Our client submitted to DNA testing against evidence at the crime scene. It was negative. There has been no surveillance video. There are no text messages. There is no cell-site dates, no ballistics, no forensics, no fingerprints. It's the absence of evidence. On top of that, we notified the Court and submitted to the Government notice of alibi. We believe our alibi witnesses are exceptionally strong. Granted the Government can take its position, but I'll say this about them. We've noted in our application that one was a former correctional officer and is a school teacher. And the other one --THE COURT: We're talking about, so I'm clear, there are two proposed alibi witnesses, one. Of whom is Mr. Jordan's mother; is that correct? And the other is an individual with whom he is in a relationship. I want to make sure I'm clear about who we're talking about; is that right? MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, one correction. I appreciate the question to clarify it. No, it's not his mother. It's his girlfriend at the time. THE COURT: Girlfriend at the time. MR. HUESTON: Mother of his oldest child and her mother.

THE COURT: And her mother. I've got it. Fair enough.

MR. HUESTON: That's the alibi that we presented.

# BAIL APPLICATION

THE COURT: Who is who? You were describing what they did, et cetera. The mom was the former correction officer?

MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. The mother is the former correction officer and current school teacher. His girlfriend, or former girlfriend, is the mother of his eldest child.

THE COURT: They are prepared to testify at trial that Mr. Jordan was with them at the time of the Mizell homicide? Are you intending to put them before me today?

MR. HUESTON: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: What am I supposed to use to assess anything with respect to the credibility of the alibi witnesses to give the notion of the alibi witnesses any weight in this hearing at all? They are not here.

MR. HUESTON: Correct, they are not testifying today. We are not proffering them to testify.

THE COURT: How am I going to rely on anything about them if you're not going to proffer them so I can have the ability to assess them and what they have to say?

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, we're proceeding by attorney proffer on this issue.

THE COURT: That's a tough one when this is, in large measure, some credibility determinations that I'd have to assess. But go ahead.

# BAIL APPLICATION

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, I take your point. We see it in terms of the broad issue. If you look at the pieces with the lack of evidence we've been putting together, we submitted the alibi. The Government is proceeding by proffer in many respects as well.

THE COURT: And an Indictment, which creates itself probable cause. So Mr. Jordan has been indicted on a number of offenses. That Indictment itself, right, creates probable cause for the Court to be able to consider. Yes?

MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. We're not disputing this is a presumption case.

THE COURT: I get that.

MR. HUESTON: We're locked into that.

THE COURT: You referenced the Government proceeding by proffer, and I'm saying it's a little bit more than that.

Because I do have, against the back drop of a Grand Jury

Indictment, where there was sworn testimony that was provided to a Grand Jury.

MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. What I'm referring to is there are many other proffers that the Government is making. I don't want to belabor the point. They made proffers about arrests, other issues. They are proceeding by proffer. We think it's appropriate also, granted, your Honor can assess our credibility on the issue, but I don't have much more to add on it.

# BAIL APPLICATION

THE COURT: Right, but for the purposes of this case given the fact that it is a presumption case, it is your burden to come forth with evidence, right, for the Court to be able to assess. Evidence is the word.

MR. HUESTON: It's a limited presumption, your Honor. I do take your point. And it's a number of different factors.

The Government has to show by clear and convincing evidence that my client is a danger. Then also by a preponderance that he's a risk of flight. And we do have to make an assessment of the package in terms of the strength to overcome the presumption.

THE COURT: Right, but the rebuttal presumption -
I'm reading your submission: To rebut the penalty supposition

by coming forth with evidence that he does not pose a danger

to the community or risk of flight.

Then of course if you're able to do that, then I would be looking to the Government and then asking them what they have in response. But the starting point is for you to proffer evidence that would rebut that presumption, then I would turn to them and ask them to meet their burden.

I want to first assess that you have met yours.

MR. HUESTON: I understand, your Honor. I appreciate it. I think it's the correct way to do it.

Let me speak to other points that go to the strength

# BAIL APPLICATION

of the Government's case. For instance, I pointed out the lack of evidence in terms of forensics. What we really understand, this case is based on witness testimony. Another assessment that I think is a fair consideration for the Court, as we mentioned, is the number of Brady disclosures in this case, which is in our view, unprecedented. Our count, I don't think the Government disputes, is 14 different Brady disclosures that happened in this case. I think that's a fair assessment for the Court to look at.

THE COURT: Fourteen Brady disclosures with respect to the count which charges Mr. Jordan --

MR. HUESTON: The Mizell homicide.

Let me be fair, some of them have to do with issues that have to do with narcotics, but that's the minority, it's really the Mizell homicide.

The next issue I want to point out, your Honor, in terms of the Government's strength of the case, in terms of the assessment of -- I guess how the Government appears to want to prove its case. Reliance on rap lyrics, I want to talk about that. They said that's part of the mix.

THE COURT: It's not part of the mix for me. Let's be clear. Let me make it clear to the Government, because there are a number of pages in the Government's submission that does recount lyrics from rap music that that was performed or produced in this case as proffered by the

# BAIL APPLICATION

Government by Mr. Jordan. Certainly the lyrics are particularly violent, but let's be clear, this is a genre of music that encourages and promotes violent language in its lyrics. And this is, in part, for the profit of the artists as well for the music executives, that my personal estimation is they profit greatly off of the encouragement of violence and misogyny, et cetera, in rap music. I'm not going to hold any individual accountable for the lyrics in a rap song that is consumed by our community; and in fact, it's consumed by me. So that's not part of the total mix for this Court.

However, there is much other information contained in the Government's submission that is not reliant upon lyrics to rap songs. There are interviews that they cited to that is not a lyric to a rap song. There are other violent crimes that Mr. Jordan is at least alleged to have been involved in.

And so we can take the rap music out of the mix.

This is never going to be a courtroom where I'm going to penalize any individual for participating in that artistic form.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ HUESTON:}$$  Understood, your Honor. I'll move on from that portion.

One other factor before addressing a couple of points you brought up. The decision not to seek the death penalty. I think that's a fair consideration for the Court to look at the strength of the case.

# BAIL APPLICATION

THE COURT: The strength of the case?

MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. The decision itself, we do think that draws an inference of regarding the decision. When you look at the mitigating and aggregating factors, that's an assessment the Government makes. So clearly they made a decision not to seek, and that's an appropriate area for this Court to take note of.

THE COURT: You want me to, A, assume or make the logical leap that if the Government decides not to seek the death penalty in any death eligible case -- I have a number of death eligible cases on my docket -- that that determination in and of itself should suggest that the Government doubts the weight of the strength of its case as to the underlying crime?

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, in terms of mitigating factors that's an assessment they look at in making that determination. That's the way --

THE COURT: One of many. I have no idea what went into the Government's determination why they didn't seek the death penalty in this case. I suspect if you examine the history of death penalty cases in this district, you would find that it is rare indeed that the Government seeks the death penalty. I don't believe that that necessarily suggests that the Government does not believe in the weight of the evidence in a particular crime. God, I hope that that's not what we're saying. Because then the suggestion should be that

we should seek the death penalty almost willy nilly just to prove that the case is strong. And we wouldn't want that. I wouldn't want that. You wouldn't want that. Defendants wouldn't want that. Rather, we would like for the death penalty determination to be made based on the consideration of a host of factors. Yes? As opposed to simply guilt or innocence.

MR. HUESTON: I'm not suggesting otherwise. I'm not. I'm sorry if I'm not stating my argument as clearly. It is a factor -- underlying that decision is the issue about the lack of evidence, the issue of alibi. And we think it's factor that it vindicates our point regarding the strength of their case. Nothing more than that. That's all I'm suggesting.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HUESTON: Just to move on, your Honor. To go to the points in terms of you mentioned about violent criminal past. What the Government proffered on four different incidents, I would just note that two of them were dismissed and two of them resulted in violations, which are not crimes. So we do not believe it's a fair inference to draw that Mr. Jordan is dangerous based on those incidents.

THE COURT: Let be clear what we're talking about. There are a number of instances that were highlighted in the Government's submission. You are absolutely correct in your

# BAIL APPLICATION

recitation of the disposition of those incidents. At least according to the Government, there were seven occasions, I believe, where Mr. Jordan had made sales of narcotics to an undercover officer. That's one among the incidents.

There is a February 2003 incident where Mr. Jordan was arrested in connection with a dispute that occurred where Mr. Jordan is alleged to have fired a semi-automatic pistol, and one shot into the air, for which he pled guilty to disorderly conduct.

There are incidents that it's alleged that

Mr. Jordan, again in 2003, fired several shots from a gun and
at an individual, one striking the individual in the leg.

According to the Government, the witness refused to cooperate
and, therefore, the charges were dismissed.

Then a 2004 incident where a search warrant was executed at Mr. Jordan's home. And in his home a 9-millimeter semi-automatic pistol was recovered, a loaded .32 caliber revolver, and a bullet-proof vest, along with 150 bags of marijuana, and various bags and foil wraps containing cocaine, and hundreds of glassine envelopes used for packaging narcotics. Yes?

These are the incidents that you wanted to highlight that the disposition was what in those three in particular?

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, either dismissals or as

you mentioned the disorderly conduct.

# BAIL APPLICATION

What we're simply saying, your Honor, is that based on those dispositions, this Court cannot make an inference that the conduct itself was proven. The Government is proceeding by proffer. It would be different if they had a disposition to the fact. So that's the point --

THE COURT: Should I discount them all together because of the disposition? We know how the criminal justice system operates. We know there are various factors that can sometimes come into a disposition of a matter. We're not talking about one, but we're talking about many.

How should the Court view the numerosity of the alleged violent conduct notwithstanding the disposition?

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, I think it's the same answer each time, that it should not be considered regardless of the amount. I don't think there is anything different in terms of the analysis. The lack of a disposition that ended against Mr. Jordan in a negative way is something that is just a fact. That's all I want to say about it.

THE COURT: He doesn't have an adult criminal record.

MR. HUESTON: He does not --

THE COURT: He has one juvenile.

MR. HUESTON: That's correct.

I'll talk about the 2017 issue which is, there was no arrest in that case. I do want to distinguish that. If

# BAIL APPLICATION

can you hear me out on this, your Honor. I'm going to try to explain it as best I can.

THE COURT: Am I striking you as someone who will cut you off?

MR. HUESTON: At times, yes, your Honor. I appreciate an active judge who is involved. I appreciate that you keep me thinking. I appreciate what you're asking.

THE COURT: I'll hear you out. Go ahead.

MR. HUESTON: The 2017, what I would say is, one, he wasn't arrested for it. I want to point that out. That was the basis of the (b)(1)(c) weight in the case, the initial aspect which is not a presumption case. That's the only solid evidence we have seen. I say solid in terms of, the Government has something to point to, compared to what I talked about which is general statements about narcotics activity. Here they are saying we have video, we have audio for 2017.

I note, though, they did not arrest him in 2017, or '18, or '19 or '20. That raises an issue. One, if the Government believes he's this person who is involved with continuous narcotics activity, the decision not to arrest is perplexing. It goes towards whether or not this is really an overstatement that he's a person who is involved in so much narcotics activity.

Also it goes to in terms of dangerousness. As well,

# BAIL APPLICATION

the decision not to arrest in 2017 says something about law enforcement's approach to him. It seems I think a fair inference to draw that they haven't, the deals happened, from their standpoint there was a lack of concern or bandwidth to address that issue. It cuts both ways that fact. So I want to point that out.

THE COURT: Give me a moment.

Much of your written submission focuses on your arguments concerning the Indictment as to Mr. Mizell's homicide. With respect to the remaining charges here, of which there are many, I want to make sure that I'm understanding that the thrust of your argument is that the Court should view the Government's — if I'm putting words in your mouth you can correct me — delay in acting upon any supposed belief in criminality here as suggesting that the strength of that case with respect to the other charges is underwhelming. That's the argument with respect to the remaining charges and that the Court should view the delay in the Government acting as somehow speaking to the strength of those charges?

MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. Also I'd want to point out in terms of the cases that actually result in an arrest, I do think it's an important issue about the risk of flight. In those case there is no warrant history. I think that's a fair assessment. That Mr. Jordan was arrested on

# BAIL APPLICATION

charges and there is no issue about him returning to court. I think that's a fair consideration.

I do want to talk a bit about the narcotics aspect of the case.

THE COURT: I want to take a step back. Mr. Jordan never faced charges that carry the sort of potential consequences as these charges do. As we've discussed, he doesn't have an adult record.

So shouldn't the Court consider isn't it an appropriate consideration for the Court the amount of time that Mr. Jordan could be subject to if found guilty? I believe the statutory minimums here, and you'll correct me if I'm wrong, if convicted of these charges, 25 years as a minimum.

So while I appreciate the arguments you made, how is it that the Court should view that? Isn't it the case that the Court should view that as a consideration for the purposes of risk of flight? He didn't previously flee, he didn't have prior charges. But now he has charges that could subject him to almost as many years in prison as he's been alive.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, he was arrested on four occasions. One, according to the Government, involved a shooting where someone was injured. I do think they are comparable, that's a serious charge. Here we have a shooting. The Government is alleging someone was wounded. He appeared

and didn't flee. I think they are comparable to a degree.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Clearly, as you recite, your Honor, the amount of time goes into the decision, but that's also one of the reasons I do think this is a fair point to talk about the strength of the package.

We have 16 individuals who are family members and You have the moral suasion. You have a bond of a million dollars and the absolute financial harm or devastation that would be set upon them if he were to violate his conditions or flee or commit a crime or violate the conditions of release. We have the issue of -- what we've proposed, is electronic monitoring, house arrest, and obviously where he would live have to be approved by Pretrial Services. believe, that residence would be back with his girlfriend and his two children, and his girlfriend is an assistant deputy warden for the New York City Department of Corrections. think that's sufficient to allay -- to deal with the Court's concern, I should say, about a risk of flight. The package itself buttresses and makes sure that's not going to happen. It's a factor that this Court should look at.

For instance, if we came in here with one suretor and no package I think that's a fair consideration for the Court to look at. We have 16 suretors, financially responsible people and we propose a bond with property and cash. I do think that's a factor the Court should look at.

# BAIL APPLICATION

1 THE COURT: This is the property of his father in 2 Georgia; is that right? 3 MR. HUESTON: His father in Georgia. And my understanding it's not the grandmother it's the aunt, your 4 5 Honor. 6 THE COURT: Your footnote three to the submission: 7 They may be willing to post their properties. 8 Words matter. Why do you caveat that with "may." 9 MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, my understanding is that 10 they will do it. It's not may. We've confirmed that. stand by that 100 percent. 11 They are willing to do it. 12 A couple of other points just to mention, your 13 Honor. 14 All right. THE COURT: 15 MR. HUESTON: The other issue I want to point out 16 this goes to our other basis. We also put forward an 17 alternative argument of temporary release. On large part he 18 has one kidney. He donated a kidney; his mother needed kidney 19 transplant. 20 THE COURT: Which, by the way, is incredibly 21 honorable and commendable on Mr. Jordan's part. Go ahead. 22 MR. HUESTON: And so we do think that during the 23 time of COVID there is an issue. 24 THE COURT: Is there a medical basis to suggest that 25 he's at a higher risk of having a negative COVID outcome by

# BAIL APPLICATION

virtue of the fact that he has a single kidney? I understand that if the single remaining kidney were to fail, obviously, that would propose a problem medically. However, my question to you is, do you have a medical basis to suggest that because he lives with a single kidney, that he is by virtue of that fact, more susceptible to a high-risk outcome as a result of COVID?

Mr. Jordan, it's probably better if you don't interrupt your lawyer while I'm asking him a question because then he can't answer my question.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, it's our position that yes, because --

THE COURT: Not your position. I said do you have anything you can offer me from a doctor? I'm certain you're talented. I'm certain you're smart. So am I. But I'm not medical doctor. Neither are you.

Do you have a medical basis, something that you can provide to me from a medical expert, a doctor of any kind, who can say that the fact that he lives with a single kidney makes him more susceptible to a negative outcome if he were to contract COVID?

MR. HUESTON: The short answer is we have not submitted that application. But I do want to speak to the issue, your Honor. This is how we arrive at our conclusion and why we think there is a force to it.

# BAIL APPLICATION

He has one kidney. That basis itself puts him at risk if he were to have complications from COVID-19. That's not our circumstance right now that we're dealing with. We agree with that. He's standing next to me. He's well. We do see it as a factor in making a determination.

Also the issue in terms of lockdown --

THE COURT: Is he, in terms of his health, I understand he has one, any different than any other 36-year-old -- I think I got his age right -- healthy man? I understand if something were to happen to this kidney he would be. But as he sits here today, isn't he as healthy as any other 36-year-old? I have nothing reported in your submission, in pretrial's submission, to suggests that he has any medical issues. So he's just a healthy 36-year-old right now.

MR. HUESTON: He's a little older than that.

THE COURT: Forgive me.

MR. HUESTON: I'm not trying to be facetious. He's

38.

THE COURT: Fair enough. He was 36 at the time of his arrest. I lost two years, 38.

MR. HUESTON: The base line itself is he only has one kidney. He has higher risk if he were to have issues with COVID.

THE COURT: But you don't have a medical basis for

1 that.

2 MR. HUESTON: We do think that the lack of kidney 3 itself is the medical basis.

THE COURT: And you're basing that on your medical expertise?

MR. HUESTON: No, your Honor, I'm not basing. I don't have medical expertise.

THE COURT: So you have nothing to offer me that I can look to to rely on to be able to say that the argument that you're making has any teeth.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, all I can say is that the lack of kidney is something we feel we had to present to you.

THE COURT: I understand that you have to tell me and I get that. But you could have told me that and said look at this letter from a doctor. This doctor has said that as a result of having a single functioning kidney, right, that makes him otherwise healthy right now, there is nonetheless some particular acute, unique risk that he faces different from another healthy 38-year-old.

I'm not taking issue with the fact that you raised the fact that Mr. Jordan donated a kidney to his mom; and therefore, is living with a single kidney. But what I understand is that he is living a healthy life as any other 38-year-old man at this time. And if there was something else beyond that, I would have expected for you to have provided

# BAIL APPLICATION

that to me. So that it is not just lawyer argument, but based in evidence of something.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, I take your point. We have no further information on that issue.

THE COURT: But you could have. You could have.

You could have called a doctor. I don't know what a kidney specialist is called, it's escaping me. You could have contacted one, you could have given me information.

All I have is a healthy 38-year-old man who, again did something incredible for his mom, but nonetheless is a healthy man at 38, functioning with a single kidney with no health issues.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, there is nothing further I have to add on the point. But again, I do think that that statement itself in terms of his physical condition, that's what we proffered to you and told you about.

I'm prepared to move on.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. HUESTON: I did want to emphasize it, I think it's important --

THE COURT: I don't know how important it can be if you've given me nothing but your argument and no evidence. If it was that important I think you should have treated it with the importance that you believe it has. You can't expect me to treat it with that level of importance if you didn't.

1 Go ahead.

MR. HUESTON: The other issues I want to talk about with respect to COVID-19, your Honor, is in terms of quality of representation in dealing with the consistent lockdowns.

That's a factor the Court should look at.

Your Honor, is fully aware of the different orders that have gone in and the issues that have occurred at MDC in this case, and we think that's a factor the Court should look at in terms of a temporary release. We ask your Honor to look at that.

THE COURT: When you say look at that, you're talking about specifically difficulties that you are having in terms of the preparation for any eventual trial in this matter, or are you talking about the conditions that Mr. Jordan has had to endure as a result of the COVID-19 virus? They are obviously related, but different. Can you tell me what you're referring to specifically with respect to this argument?

MR. HUESTON: We're talking about the conditions that he's had to endure. That's one part. The other part is for instance lockdowns, we can't have access to him. Both of them are part of that determination, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, unless there is specific questions that you have, there is nothing else that I have to

# BAIL APPLICATION

say. Obviously I'll wait to hear from the Government, but that concludes my opening remarks.

THE COURT: I'll give you an opportunity when the Government is done.

As you can see, I've asked you the questions that I've had for you up until now as they have come to mind, which is my style. I'm going to hear from the Government. Thank you.

MR. McCONNELL: Thank you, your Honor. I'm not going to repeat my whole submission. I think your Honor's identified some of the relevant points as far as the context that we're operating in, which is a presumption case. There are four separate counts that Mr. Jordan is charged with, that each standing on their own, carry with them a presumption of detention.

Obviously the nature and circumstances of the crime speak for themselves. This was a premeditated homicide case, 20 years old, but nevertheless shooting someone in the head while conspiring with others is such a brazen act of criminal act that I don't think time should matter when considering the severity of the conduct.

Also the attendant drug trafficking and 924(c) charges. These are very serious crimes standing on their own. The case law supports your Honor making the inference that these are both serious in terms of their potential sentencing

# BAIL APPLICATION

exposure but also in terms of the danger they present to the community.

THE COURT: What do you say to -- putting aside the homicide charge for a moment -- I'm curious to your response to defense counsel's comments regarding the delay or the dilatory nature of the Government's act with respect to pursuing any of the narcotics charges and any attendant 924(c) charges from 2016/2017 time period.

MR. McCONNELL: That's a common argument that we here during any prolonged investigation where the arrest does not occur immediately after the criminal conduct takes place. All I will say about that, is that investigations take time. There are a lot of moving pieces. As your Honor can see from the Indictment, this was not simply an undercover buy and bust operation. And I'm going to leave it at that, frankly. The Court is going to have to draw whatever inference it can.

In any case where there is a lapse between the arrest and the criminal conduct, to simply say that the Government is not concerned about the dangerousness of that individual I think is wrong.

Let me segue into the strength of the case; counsel did spend a fair amount of time on that. I want to deal with the idea that the Brady disclosures in this case somehow prove that the evidence is not sufficient to convict Mr. Jordan beyond a reasonable doubt.

#### 

# BAIL APPLICATION

This is 20-year-old murder case. It involved a very high-profile individual being gunned down in his own music studio, in his own neighborhood, by people that he knew.

There has been a tremendous amount of investigation in this case, and for that reason we have given what I consider to be practically open-file discovery to the defense. Because, frankly, I'm not in a position to tell them what is going to be useful to their defense at trial.

So what we have done is virtually provide them with things I think go above and beyond our Rule 16 and Brady obligations. I strongly disagree with the insinuation that in doing so we are saying something about the strength of our case.

This is going to be a case that relies on witness testimony, both eye witnesses and co-conspirator testimony.

We do not credit the alibi witnesses. These are people who have a very close familial and financial relationship with Mr. Jordan that spans years. One of the alibi witnesses was arrested with Mr. Jordan in 2014. They were living together --

THE COURT: What was the disposition of that case? It's not in your submission.

MR. McCONNELL: With respect to the alibi witness? I don't know.

THE COURT: With respect to the arrest that took

# BAIL APPLICATION

place in Mr. Jordan's home with a 9-millimeter recovered, the .32 revolver was recovered.

MR. McCONNELL: Yes, there were several individuals who were present in that house when the search warrant was executed, seven or eight, including Mr. Jordan and one of the alibi witnesses. I could speculate as to why --

THE COURT: I'm saying, there were no charges that were ever pursued in that case? Nothing as to the disposition unless I missed it.

MR. McCONNELL: I believe it was a disorderly conduct disposition with respect to this defendant.

THE COURT: The December 2004 --

MR. McCONNELL: '14 -- excuse me, 2004, yes.

THE COURT: It's not in your submission. The 2003 disposition is in your submission where Mr. Jordan pleaded guilty to a disorderly conduct. I don't see any mention in your submission to the disposition of the --

MR. McCONNELL: That was resolved with a disorderly conduct as well.

THE COURT: As well. I see.

MR. McCONNELL: Again, there is case law to support this. I believe in the Jones case there was a hearing where the alibi witnesses were called. And the mere fact that they had a very close family relationship, obviously motive to be less than truthful about the defendant's whereabouts in that

case. The Court for purposes of a detention hearing did not credit their testimony.

THE COURT: I don't have anything to credit or not credit. I don't have anyone here so.

MR. McCONNELL: Certainly on paper there is a clear motive to fabricate, and we'll save that for trial. As far as the DNA evidence --

THE COURT: Let me take a step back. I'm not going to presume to presume a motive to fabricate. I'm not going to presume anything. I don't have them here. I have, at least by defense counsel's account, a woman who was a former correction officer and a school teacher.

So I'm not, as I sit here today, going to make a statement to suggest that that woman, who is not the mother of Mr. Jordan, that she would fabricate, has a motive to fabricate. The Court will make no finding nor rely on any representations in that regard.

What I will say is, I don't have an alibi witness who was called to provide evidence in this bail hearing.

That's as much as I can say as to the alibi witnesses.

Go ahead.

MR. McCONNELL: Moving on to the issue of what the defense as characterized as exculpatory DNA evidence. It's really nothing of the sort. This was a crime scene where lots of people are going in and out. Lots of people stayed there

# BAIL APPLICATION

and actually would live there on occasion. There was a hat that was recovered near Mr. Mizell's body with a mixture of several individual's DNA in that hat, and the defendant was not one of them. I don't view that as exculpatory. The defense can use it to make whatever arguments at trial. The fact an article of clothing containing lots of other DNA in a location where lots of people congregate and occasionally lived, to me is not significant, certainly for our purposes here today.

The other thing that I want to say is that the remaining charges, which again carry a presumption of detention, carry substantial sentencing exposure in the form of mandatory minimum sentences. Those are unassailable.

Mr. Jordan is recorded on both audio and video making narcotics sales to an undercover agent of law enforcement. We have witnesses who are going to testify not only to purchasing narcotics from him but to seeing him with a firearm such that they can even describe the type and the color of it and where he was keeping it in the car. Which by the way, some witnesses will say that one of his children was in the car while he was conducting this sort of activity as well. So this is really not an argument that I think should be given much credence.

The Grand Jury has heard evidence twice. He's been indicted for these crimes twice. That provides in and of

itself an independent determination of probable cause. And I don't think that the inquiry needs to go further, certainly in the absence of any evidence proffered by --

THE COURT: You mentioned, you make reference in your submission on page nine, about Mr. Jordan being in possession of an untraceable and unmonitored contraband cellphone while incarcerated.

MR. McCONNELL: Yes.

THE COURT: But that's all that you said. Can you provide a little bit more color?

MR. McCONNELL: Sure. Mr. Jordan's cell was searched by members of the MDC. He was found in possession of a cellphone in his cell. I can't tell you that much more about it because the SIM card had been removed. It's not clear who the defendant was calling or what he was using that phone for.

It's a good point because, number one, even subject to COVID restrictions, 23-hour lockdowns a day sometimes, he still manages to get his hands on a cellphone, which I'm told can cost several thousand dollars. It requires coordination with someone not in the facility in order to get it in. It shows the attitude that he would take towards even the most restrictive conditions that could be imposed in a home detention situation. This is not an insignificant factor.

Even in prison he's committing crimes by possessing a

# BAIL APPLICATION

contraband cellphone.

THE COURT: Can you speak to -- I'm trying to have a better sense of the bases for the Government's assertions on the bottom of page eight of its submission with respect to -- you have it under the nature and circumstance of the charged offense, but it also goes to the question of dangerousness. You talk about the attempts to or efforts to threaten or and tamper with witnesses. What is the bases for your argument in that regard?

MR. McCONNELL: Witnesses telling us that.

THE COURT: In this case or prior cases?

MR. McCONNELL: No, in this case. There are lots of reasons, I'll say, that it took 20 years to finally bring this case to the position that it is now. But a lot of it does have to do with the fear that people have of Mr. Jordan. It's not just a fear that is without justification or speculative fear. Mr. Jordan has made it clear to people that they should not testify. My understanding is that even one of the suretors has reached out to potential witnesses in this case.

I think that, to go back to the cellphone, the fact that he's got an unmonitored, untraceable way to communicate with people who can act on his behalf outside of the MDC really puts a fine point on that.

I want to be careful because I don't want this to turn into a discovery hearing. I want to be careful about

what I say about particular witnesses. But that's the context that we're operating in.

Can I address a few additional points?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. McCONNELL: Thank you. With respect to history and characteristics, the point has been made that these crimes were either dismissed or ended in disorderly conduct, which is a non-criminal disposition. But the case law is clear that your Honor can consider both charged and uncharged conduct when considering the issue of dangerousness. That's all I'll say on that. The case law permits the Court to do that.

On the COVID issue, I am completely sympathetic to the difficulties that the pandemic has caused, really the entire criminal justice system, in moving cases forward. I really do feel that defense counsel makes a very good point when he talks about the difficulties in preparing for a trial of this magnitude with these sorts of restrictions. However, that's not unique to Mr. Jordan, number one. Number two, the case law is very, very clear that in the absence of sort of an imminent hearing that release is just an extraordinary remedy to consider.

As the Court is well aware, we're not going to trial on this case for sometime. So I think that given the body of case law on this issue out of this courthouse and out of the Southern District of New York to release him on that basis,

# BAIL APPLICATION

one, distinguishes him in a way that I don't think is justified from other defendants. And two, is extremely premature.

I'll reiterate my offer to defense counsel that we are willing to help make whatever accommodations are necessary in order for them to meet with Mr. Jordan, whether bringing him to the courthouse, bringing him to the United States

Attorney's Office, whatever can be done we will make happen.

They just have to ask. But regardless I think this is premature.

Your Honor, has already brought out the point that I wanted to make about the defendant's health status. I think this is really a non-issue. It's certainly uncorroborated. I don't have anything else to say about that.

Finally, with respect to the strength of the bail package, I really don't have much to say about that either. We haven't been provided any information. I don't know the identities of the suretors. I haven't been given anything about the properties that are being put up or their potential value. We haven't been able to do any due diligence whatsoever beyond what was put in the public filing. And that's fine, but I think, again in the context of a presumption case, where the charges are this serious, it shouldn't carry the day.

Mr. Jordan presents a risk of flight and a danger to

# BAIL APPLICATION

the community that can really only be addressed by continuing remand and that's what I would ask the Court to do.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

MR. HUESTON: Just a couple of points. With respect to the narcotics part of the case. I would note in the 2017 controlled buys that the Government is talking about, one thing of note is there is no allegation of any weapons or firearms and use. Again, I think this goes to the strength of the other allegations. I just want to point that out.

THE COURT: How dangerous do you think drug trafficking is to our community? I'm just curious.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor --

THE COURT: I want to know if you're drawing the line of dangerousness only with respect to guns and only with respect to the murder charge. Or, do you view the sale of narcotics in our communities as also a danger to our community? Or, are you asking me not to?

MR. HUESTON: I'm asking you not to, your Honor.

The idea of just selling drugs in and of itself, that does not show dangerousness.

THE COURT: Really?

MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. I think that's a fair view of the case law.

What I'm pointing out about the 2017, here the Government is purporting there were controlled buys and in

# BAIL APPLICATION

I'm bringing up on that, your Honor. We asked the Government particulars about any weapons used and it's not been forthcoming. We asked, can you give us a TPO, a date where Mr. Jordan actually used a firearm in relation to narcotics. It's not happened. We've asked for this information. I do think that's a fair rebuttal to what the Government said.

THE COURT: If you could repeat that?

MR. HUESTON: We asked the Government for the time place and occurrence of uses of firearms with respect to Mr. Jordan. It's not in the 2017 controlled buys, it's not there.

THE COURT: Did you look at -- I'm just curious -the authority cited by the Government? Page seven of the
submission speaks specifically to the dangerousness as to
narcotics trafficking. I think you just said to me the case
law is clear. I'm curious how you square your argument to the
Court with the Second Circuit's determination in U.S. vs.
Millan 1993 and U.S. vs. Leon, which is I believe a 1985 case,
it's cited on page seven of the Government's submission, in
terms of how it is that I should view narcotics trafficking
for the purposes of bail, not for the purposes -- I'm not
suggesting that if we were in a sentencing hearing and we were
looking at enhancement, et cetera. But for these purposes,
when I'm looking at a dangerousness prong, are you suggesting

# BAIL APPLICATION

that ongoing narcotics trafficking isn't something that the Court should view as falling under the umbrella of dangerousness? If not, tell me how I should view this authority that is cited by the Government on page seven of its submission.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, I maintain my position about that. This is my response: We're looking at dangerousness. The factors by clear and convincing evidence -- by clear and convincing that Mr. Jordan presents a physical danger to individuals. I don't see that --

THE COURT: I need you to square it with the case law. I understand what you're urging me to view it. And what I'm telling you is that there is authority in this circuit, not in this district but the Court of Appeals, that says that the dangerousness calculation can and should include ongoing narcotics trafficking. This is not about your opinion or mine. So against the case law, which you got their submission just like I did, cited at page seven of the Government's submission.

MR. HUESTON: The response is really this, your Honor, so for instance in every case involving narcotics, (b)(1)(c) weight, that is not itself put into the presumption in terms of a person being incarcerated. As we look at it, it's the weight that is pushing the presumptions in the case. That's really the gravamen of the response. It's the weights

drug dealing in and of itself --

THE COURT: When you say the weight, the quantity?

MR. HUESTON: The quantity.

THE COURT: The quantity of drugs involved.

MR. HUESTON: Yes. So in and of itself the

statement "drug dealing itself is danger" --

THE COURT: We have seven controlled buys, so it's the ongoing nature, the potential ongoing nature, right. So one buy of a small quantity, I hear what you're saying. But what the Government is urging the Court to see is that we're talking about ongoing activity. So if you have a number an accumulation of small buys, to your point, you now have moved to a greater weight.

What the Government is saying is, your Honor, this is evidence of ongoing narcotics trafficking.

So for you to tell me but, Judge, there were no guns, there was no guns in the videos. But what I'm saying is I need to look at the narcotics trafficking as well. And you have to address in light of the case law why it is that that is not a consideration for dangerousness that I should undertake here.

MR. HUESTON: What I would add is this, your Honor, as well. Maybe I didn't say this as clear as I needed to say. Besides the 2017 controlled buys we have no other evidence in terms of invoices, narcotics reports —

# BAIL APPLICATION

THE COURT: I was about to make a Whitney Houston 1 2 No invoices, no receipts on the drug buys? 3 MR. HUESTON: I'm talking about New York City 4 undercover operations, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: I see. Okay. 6 MR. HUESTON: I apologize if I'm not being as clear 7 as I should be. That's what I'm talking. I'm not suggesting 8 drug dealers --9 THE COURT: What we do have is an Indictment where 10 there was witnesses testimony, Grand Jury Indictment 11 concerning ongoing drug activity that occurred over a period 12 of some years, not an isolated drug transaction but an ongoing 13 drug trafficking operation. That's what I have. That's what 14 I have probable cause for. The Grand Jury Indictment itself creates probable cause as to those crimes. And the crimes are 15 16 not isolated but ongoing drug trafficking. 17 MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, they have the Indictment. And you're correct in pointing it out. I don't have much 18 19 more, other than to say what I was pointing out with the 2017 20 issue is that in those instances there is no guns in play. 21 THE COURT: I hear you. 22 MR. HUESTON: That's really all I'm saying about 23 that. 24 I've asked for a particularization about any other 25 guns and it's not been forthcoming from the Government.

#### 

# BAIL APPLICATION

THE COURT: I get that. And for the purposes of the trial and the Government's burden of proof and what they need to prove to sustain the charges. But for the purposes of my caliculus here and looking dangerousness, guns are not dispositive, is my point.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, I don't disagree with what you're saying. I think it's the accumulation of different issues. I just point out the issue.

Then I'll say this, your Honor, the Government did point out that in December 2004 they mentioned there were eight individuals arrested. I think that's a complicated mix. He has a disorderly conduct from that. That's not dispositive with respect to Mr. Jordan. With respect to the DNA mixture, we went a little bit further than that.

They identified an individual with respect to the mixture. It's not just, it was a mix, they got to a lead and actually got to a person. We point that fact out, that DNA was recovered. They tested it. They tested it against my client. It came to a different person.

That's the point we want to make. It goes to the quality of the case that they are going to present.

No one is saying that the Government has been remised. They've been giving us, as they must, Brady material in the case. They are filling their obligation, it appears to us.

# BAIL APPLICATION

We do point out it's a little bit more than just a 1 2 mix that it didn't go to anywhere. It went to a person. 3 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 4 MR. HUESTON: It went to a person that they've 5 identified. 6 THE COURT: I see. MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, I'll end on this, unless 7 8 there are other questions that you have. I think this goes to 9 the risk of flight. Again we did mention there was this 10 Netflix show in 2018. 11 THE COURT: I didn't see it, but okay. 12 MR. HUESTON: They call it a true crime documentary. 13 Mr. Jordan is talked about as taking part in this murder. I 14 would point out, Mr. Jordan didn't flee or run away or try to 15 leave anywhere. He's living his life. 16 THE COURT: You'll forgive me, how does Netflix 17 factor into that? 18 MR. HUESTON: That folks believe you're responsible 19 for this murder. He doesn't run away or try to escape. 20 lives in the neighborhood. He lives in Hollis. Nothing has changed about his life. That's the point I want to make about 21 22 that. 23 THE COURT: He knew that as of the Netflix 24

documentary that there were more than just rumors in the neighborhood that there was focus on him, but nonetheless he

Rivka Teich CSR RPR RMR FCRR Official Court Reporter

25

didn't flee. 1 2 MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. I think that says 3 something about his willingness to participate in this 4 process. 5 THE COURT: What did Mr. Jordan receive this cash 6 settlement from and when did he get that? 7 MR. HUESTON: 2018, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: He got a cash settlement in 2018? 9 MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: For what? 11 MR. HUESTON: An accident that he was involved in. THE COURT: With whom? 12 13 MR. HUESTON: Vehicular accident. 14 THE COURT: When did the accident take place? 15 MR. HUESTON: April of 2017, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: He recovered the money when in 2018? 17 MR. HUESTON: Perhaps about 12 months later, about a 18 year later, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: I am curious. To the Government, page 20 four of your submission you talk about interviews and videos, 21 et cetera. You didn't provide any dates of any of that. 22 MR. McCONNELL: No, I didn't, your Honor. 23 generally anywhere from 2010 through the offense conduct

through 2017, 2018 still publicly available.

THE COURT: I'd like to know whether any of the

Rivka Teich CSR RPR RMR FCRR Official Court Reporter

24

25

# BAIL APPLICATION

1 photographs or videos of Mr. Jordan holding stacks of 2 100-dollar bills and other denominations, that diamond 3 encrusted jewelry, predated 2018. Can you find that out for 4 me? 5 MR. McCONNELL: I can. 6 THE COURT: Give me a moment, folks. 7 Mr. Jordan has four daughters, correct? 8 MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. 9 They each reside with their moms? THE COURT: 10 MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: They have for how long since Mr. Jordan's arrest or were they residing with their mothers 12 13 prior to his arrest? 14 MR. HUESTON: Prior to his arrest, your Honor. 15 Your Honor, take note, he was living with the two 16 youngest with the mother. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Jordan has had songs purchased? 18 MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: By whom? 20 MR. HUESTON: Dead Set and Geony (ph). 21 THE COURT: Is that a single company entity or is 22 that two? It's two artists, your Honor. 23 MR. HUESTON: 24 THE COURT: Dead Set and the other one is Geony(ph?) 25 MR. HUESTON: Sorry, G-Unit.

1 THE COURT: G-Unit. 2 MR. HUESTON: That's my mispronunciation. 3 THE COURT: When was that? MR. HUESTON: 2010 and 2011. Your Honor, it's Dip 4 5 Set and G-Unit. It's the mask, your Honor, I didn't hear the 6 information. I apologize. And maybe my lack of knowledge. 7 THE COURT: I have what I need for now. 8 Anything that Pretrial Services would like to add? 9 MR. LONG: No, your Honor. We stand by our 10 recommendation --11 THE COURT: I know you're not talking in my 12 courtroom without standing up. Has it been that long? 13 MR. LONG: We stand by our report and our 14 recommendation. Of course we're available to your Honor any 15 time to conference. 16 THE COURT: What I'd like to do is take an 17 opportunity to digest the information that we have gone over 18 here today. I think that the most prudent course is, or would 19 be for the Court, to make a determination on the record as 20 opposed to in writing which takes longer and belabors the 21 point. Will I need to set a day and time this week to do so? 22 I'd like to reconvene on Thursday at 1:00 o'clock. 23 MR. McCONNELL: Your Honor, I'm actually going to be out of town on work travel. 24 25 That's all right. The good thing it's a

> Rivka Teich CSR RPR RMR FCRR Official Court Reporter

THE COURT:

1 big old Government, you can have someone come in your place, 2 right? 3 Defense counsel, Thursday at 1:00 o'clock? 4 That's fine, your Honor. MR. HUESTON: 5 THE COURT: We're going to continue this over to 6 Thursday at 1:00 o'clock. Is there anything that you wanted 7 to add? 8 MR. HUESTON: Yes, your Honor. I did want to 9 mention that we've been provided with information from 10 Mr. Jordan's family that there has been a petition, 2400 11 individuals have signed a petition about him expressing their 12 support for him. We think that's an important factor for the 13 Court to take into consideration. 14 THE COURT: I do see that he has support in the 15 courtroom today. It is not lost on me. 16 Anything else before we adjourn, folks? 17 MR. McCONNELL: Not from the Government, your Honor. 18 Thank you. 19 MR. HUESTON: Nothing from the defense. Thank you. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate your time. 21 appreciate the diligence with which you approached this 22 hearing. I'll see you on Thursday. 23 Of course, I will not have the benefit of seeing 24 you.

MR. McCONNELL: I'm going to try to get here.

Rivka Teich CSR RPR RMR FCRR Official Court Reporter

25

BAIL APPLICATION THE COURT: We're adjourned. (Whereupon, the matter was concluded.) I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. /s/ Rivka Teich Rivka Teich, CSR RPR RMR FCRR Official Court Reporter Eastern District of New York Rivka Teich CSR RPR RMR FCRR Official Court Reporter